

**Jarczyk, Elizabeth LT RLSO SW, Coronado**

---

**From:** John, James CIV NAVAL BASE Coronado, N32 (b)(6)  
**Sent:** Friday, January 30, 2015 10:38  
**To:** Campbell, Charles E LT NBC/AIROPS, N3  
**Subject:** FW: DISPLACED THRESHOLD  
**Signed By:** (b)(6)

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Gaiani, Anthony NAS North Island ,N00  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 07, 2009 2:10 PM  
**To:** Starboard, Stephen CDR NAS North Island, N00; John, James S CIV AIR OPS,  
**Subject:** RE: DISPLACED THRESHOLD

This will never happen or even be considered so long as I am CO.

Tony Gaiani  
Captain, USN  
Commanding Officer  
Naval Base Coronado  
(b)(6)

This email contains privileged and confidential communication. Any unauthorized disclosure or misuse of the information may result in civil and criminal penalties. 18 U.S.C. Secs. 2510-2521.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Starboard, Stephen CDR NAS North Island, N00  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 07, 2009 12:59  
**To:** Gaiani, Anthony NAS North Island ,N00  
**Subject:** FW: DISPLACED THRESHOLD

Skipper,

FYI from Jim John, (b)(5)

V/R  
OPSO

-----Original Message-----

**From:** John, James S CIV AIR OPS,  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 07, 2009 11:06

Encl(5) redacted

To: Starboard, Stephen CDR NAS North Island, N00  
Subject: FW: DISPLACED THRESHOLD

-----Original Message-----

From: Strong, Bryan M CTR OPNAV, N88  
Sent: Wednesday, January 07, 2009 8:52  
To: John, James S CIV AIR OPS,  
Cc: Brown, Mark CIV OPNAV N88  
Subject: RE: DISPLACED THRESHOLD

Jim,

Displacement of your runway threshold is not a NAVFIG decision. It is the a course of action undertaken by an installation Commanding Officer and requires compliance with NAVAIR 00-80T-114 paragraphs 2.4 and 2.5 and referenced federal regulations and orders. Paragraph 2.4 because such a large displacement would radically alter your airport's operational capability and paragraph 2.5 because permanent displacement requires approval of COMNAVAIRSYSCOM (PMA-251) with copies to CNO (N885F). (b)(5)

I will refrain from offering considered impact to your (b)(5)

As to (b)(5)

(b)(5)

If this idea goes any further down range I recommend you

(b)(5)

Hope this helps.

Regards,

Bryan M. Strong (N885F4A)  
Flight Procedures Specialist  
Naval Flight Information Group

(b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: John, James S CIV AIR OPS,  
Sent: Wednesday, January 07, 2009 8:42  
To: Strong, Bryan M CTR OPNAV, N88  
Subject: DISPLACED THRESHOLD

Morning Bryan,

The city of Coronado is asking us why we can't have a 3,000' displaced threshold to Runway 29....they want to move our APZs. That would leave us a 4,500' runway for landings.

(b)(5)

Thanks for your help !!!

Jim

**Jarczyk, Elizabeth LT RLSO SW, Coronado**

---

**From:** John, James CIV NAVAL BASE Coronado, N32 <(b)(6)>  
**Sent:** Friday, January 30, 2015 10:38  
**To:** Campbell, Charles E LT NBC/AIROPS, N3  
**Subject:** FW: DISPLACED THRESHOLD  
**Signed By:** (b)(6)

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Gaiani, Anthony NAS North Island ,N00  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 07, 2009 2:10 PM  
**To:** Starboard, Stephen CDR NAS North Island, N00; John, James S CIV AIR OPS,  
**Subject:** RE: DISPLACED THRESHOLD

This will never happen or even be considered so long as I am CO.

Tony Gaiani  
Captain, USN  
Commanding Officer  
Naval Base Coronado  
(b)(6)

This email contains privileged and confidential communication. Any unauthorized disclosure or misuse of the information may result in civil and criminal penalties. 18 U.S.C. Secs. 2510-2521.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Starboard, Stephen CDR NAS North Island, N00  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 07, 2009 12:59  
**To:** Gaiani, Anthony NAS North Island ,N00  
**Subject:** FW: DISPLACED THRESHOLD

Skipper,

FYI from Jim John, 9 separate expensive and/or prohibitive reasons not to have a displaced threshold on 29.

This does not include the obvious loss of a long runway for landing heavy aircraft if needed for winds.

V/R  
OPSO

-----Original Message-----

**From:** John, James S CIV AIR OPS,  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 07, 2009 11:06



To: Starboard, Stephen CDR NAS North Island, N00  
Subject: FW: DISPLACED THRESHOLD

-----Original Message-----

From: Strong, Bryan M CTR OPNAV, N88  
Sent: Wednesday, January 07, 2009 8:52  
To: John, James S CIV AIR OPS,  
Cc: Brown, Mark CIV OPNAV N88  
Subject: RE: DISPLACED THRESHOLD

Jim,

Displacement of your runway threshold is not a NAVFIG decision. It is the a course of action undertaken by an installation Commanding Officer and requires compliance with NAVAIR 00-80T-114 paragraphs 2.4 and 2.5 and referenced federal regulations and orders. Paragraph 2.4 because such a large displacement would radically alter your airport's operational capability and paragraph 2.5 because permanent displacement requires approval of COMNAVAIRSYSCOM (PMA-251) with copies to CNO (N885F). I will not harbor a guess as to what reaction the approval authority or other higher headquarters would have to such a large proposed reduction of landing surface, but I doubt it would be positive.

I will refrain from offering considered impact to your local air operations and traffic flow as these best determined at the local level, however to retain a comparable instrument capability to a shortened landing runway 29 (assuming you would want to retain the full 7500' take off length) you would need to take the following steps:

1. Take up your approach lights and if an approach light capability is to be retained relocate and replace them with a flush mounted system aligned with the new landing threshold. Flush mounted lights are considerably more expensive than frangible above surface mounts.
2. Remark your runway to reflect a displaced threshold and paint markings on your first 3000' of runway to reflect a departure surface only.
3. Reconfigure your threshold lights into a runway end bar only, install a displaced threshold light bar, and change your first 3000' of runway lights to reflect a departure surface only.

As to TERPS impact, based on a quick general analysis only, this is the possible impact:

1. During threshold displacement construction operations would be restricted to daytime circling only while construction was underway and cautionary NOTAM action would be required to deal with construction activities.
2. All procedures would have to be redesigned, approved, and commissioning flight inspections conducted after the runway threshold has been displaced. All effected ATC video Maps (both Navy and FAA) would have to be changed to reflect these revisions.
3. There is a very real chance that there will be an impact to our ability to approve straight in approach minima using the TACAN because the threshold would be closer to the NAVAID and the angle between the runway centerline and the usable radials is already fairly significant. If straight in minima could not be approved then you would be left with circling only from the TACAN approach.
4. The VOR/DME approach would have to be redesigned and the minima or descent gradient could be impacted as the distance from the NAVAID to the threshold would increase there fore requiring higher minimum altitudes at the step down fixes and possibly making the approach steeper than it already is.

5. There is real chance that the PAR would not be usable to the new runway without significant modification to its alignment or relocation of the antenna. You would have to have SPAWAR check on the specific impact, but for sure your minima would not get lower and since there are taller trees and more occupied structures the south of the runway the further west you go along the side of the runway the PAR minima could be impacted.

6. Departures from runway 11 would be impacted as the departure end of the runway would be closer to the towers on Point Loma and the climb gradients would go up.

If this idea goes any further down range I recommend you ask NAVFIG to do an in-depth impact analysis to give you real numbers to work with.

Hope this helps.

Regards,

Bryan M. Strong (N885F4A)  
Flight Procedures Specialist  
Naval Flight Information Group  
DSN (b)(6)  
Comm. (b)(6)  
Fax (b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: John, James S CIV AIR OPS,  
Sent: Wednesday, January 07, 2009 8:42  
To: Strong, Bryan M CTR OPNAV, N88  
Subject: DISPLACED THRESHOLD

Morning Bryan,

The city of Coronado is asking us why we can't have a 3,000' displaced threshold to Runway 29....they want to move our APZs. That would leave us a 4,500' runway for landings. I know the obvious reason why we're not going to have a 3,000' displaced threshold...but what I'm looking for is the TERPS data...what would that do to our minimums??? Would NavFig even allow this to happen??? I'm coming up with a drawing to show the POFA IF we were to go with a 3,000' displaced threshold.

Thanks for your help !!!

Jim